

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed April 12, 2005 has been carefully reviewed and, in view of the above amendments and following remarks, reconsideration and allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

I. Summary of Claims

Claims 71-118 are currently pending in the application, with claims 71, 90, and 108 being independent claims. Claims 1-70 are cancelled and claims 71-118 are added. In the outstanding Office Action, each of the claims pending prior to this Amendment were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being obvious over a combination of U.S. Patent Number 6,514,154 to Finn and U.S. Patent Number 5,683,309 to Reimers.

II. The Claims Patentably Distinguish Over The Applied Prior Art

Discussion of Independent Claim 71

Independent claim 71 recites a golf club head having a face for contacting a golf ball and a weight positioning system. The weight positioning system includes a support and a weight. The support has a longitudinal axis extending along a length of the support. The weight is movable along the support and around the support to vary a position of a center of gravity of the golf club head. The weight defines an opening that extends at least partially around the support. One of an indentation and a protrusion extends along the support and in a direction substantially parallel to the longitudinal axis of the support. Another of the indentation and the protrusion is positioned within the opening. The indentation receives the protrusion to limit movement of the weight around the support.

Claim 15, which is now cancelled, included a recitation of an indentation and a protrusion. The rejection of claim 15 stated that Finn discloses protrusions (threads) extending along the support and indentations (threads) positioned within the opening. In contrast with the threads of Finn, independent claim 71 recites that the indentation or protrusion of the support extends along the support and in a direction substantially parallel to the longitudinal axis of the support. More particularly, the threads of Finn extend in a direction that is generally perpendicular to a longitudinal axis of the bolt 202, whereas independent claim 71 recites a

direction that is substantially parallel to the longitudinal axis. Reimers does not remedy this deficiency.

Based upon the above discussion, the Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 71 is allowable over the combination of Finn and Reimers. In addition, claims 72-89 should be allowable for at least the same reasons.

Discussion of Independent Claim 90

Independent claim 90 recites a golf club head having a face for contacting a golf ball and a weight positioning system. The weight positioning system includes a support, a weight, and at least one scale. The support has a longitudinal axis extending along a length of the support. The weight is movable along the support and around the support to vary a position of a center of gravity of the golf club head, and the weight defines an opening that extends at least partially around the support. The scale is located to determine a position of the weight relative to the support.

Claim 17, which is now cancelled, included a recitation of a scale. The rejection of claim 17 stated that Reimers discloses a scale at column 4, lines 26-45. More particularly, this portion of Reimers discusses the features of a balancing disk 32 that may be weighted in an eccentric manner. According to Reimers, "Further, and particularly for aesthetic purposes, it may be desirable to internalize the eccentricity such that the exterior appearance of the balancing disk 32 is uniform (except for unobtrusive markings to indicate the location of the eccentric weighting)" (Reimers, column 4, lines 40-45). At most, this passage teaches that the balancing disk 32 may have a uniform (and presumably non-eccentric) appearance for aesthetic reasons, and markings may be placed on the balancing disk 32 so that the location of the eccentric weighting relative to the balancing disk 32 may be determined. This does not teach or suggest, however, using the markings to determine a position of a weight relative to a support. Finn does not remedy this deficiency.

Additionally, claim 91 recites that the scale is positioned on a surface of the support. This configuration is neither taught nor suggested by the combination of Finn and Reimers. At most, the portion of Reimers discussed above teaches that the markings are located on the balancing disk 32.

Claim 92 recites that the at least one scale includes a first scale and a second scale. The first scale is oriented to extend in a direction substantially parallel to the longitudinal axis, and the second scale is oriented to extend in a direction substantially perpendicular to the longitudinal axis. Furthermore, claim 93 recites that the first scale determines a position of the weight along the support and the second scale determines a position of the weight around the support. This configuration is neither taught nor suggested by the combination of Finn and Reimers. At most, the portion of Reimers discussed above teaches that the markings are located on the balancing disk 32 so that the location of the eccentric weighting relative to the balancing disk 32 may be determined. This does not teach or suggest, however, the pair of scales recited in claims 92 and 93.

Claims 94 and 95 recite an indentation and a protrusion, and the scale is positioned within the indentation. Again, this configuration is neither taught nor suggested by the combination of Finn and Reimers.

Based upon the above discussion, the Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 90 and dependent claims 91-95 are allowable over the combination of Finn and Reimers. In addition, claims 96-107 should be allowable for at least the same reasons as those discussed for independent claim 90.

Discussion of Independent Claim 108

Independent claim 108 recites a golf club head having a face for contacting a golf ball and a weight positioning system. The weight positioning system includes a support and a weight. The support has a longitudinal axis extending along a length of the support. The weight is movable along the support and around the support to vary a position of a center of gravity of the golf club head. The weight includes a pair of arms that extend outward from the support, and the weight includes a pair of masses secured to end areas of the arms.

Claim 22, which is now cancelled, included a recitation wherein the weight includes a pair of arms and masses. One criterion for a prima facie case of obviousness is that the prior art must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The rejection of claim 22 stated that Reimers discloses the weight may be of any shape. The mere fact that Reimers states the weight may be of any shape does not imply that Reimers teaches or suggests the specific configuration recited by independent claim 108. More particularly, the passive suggestion that the weight may be of

any shape would not lead one skilled in the art to form a weight having a pair of arms that extend outward from the support and a pair of masses secured to end areas of the arms.

Additionally, claim 109 recites that the arms are angled with respect to each other. Based upon the same reasoning as above, this configuration is neither taught nor suggested by the combination of Finn and Reimers.

Based upon the above discussion, the Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 108 and dependent claim 109 are allowable over the combination of Finn and Reimers. In addition, claims 110-118 should be allowable for at least the same reasons.

III. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, the Applicants respectfully submit that all claims are in a condition for allowance. The Applicants respectfully request, therefore, that the rejections be withdrawn and that this application now be allowed.

This Amendment is being filed with a one-month Petition For Extension of Time by facsimile transmission on August 11, 2005. Should additional fees be deemed necessary for consideration of this Amendment, such fees are hereby requested and the Commissioner is authorized to charge deposit account number 19-0733 for the payment of the requisite fees. If anything further is desirable to place the application in even better form for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned representative at (503) 425-6800.

Respectfully submitted,

By: Byron S. Kuzara
Byron S. Kuzara
Registration No. 51,255

Banner & Witcoff, Ltd.
1001 G Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001-4597
Telephone: (202) 824-3000

Dated: August 11, 2005